

ON BLACK HOLES IN STRING THEORY[★]

Edward Witten[†]

*School of Natural Sciences
Institute for Advanced Study
Olden Lane
Princeton, NJ 08540*

In its most elementary form, the Schwarzschild solution is

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (1)$$

One quickly sees that the space-time described by this metric is not geodesically complete and hence that there must be more to the story. Indeed, analytic continuation of the Schwarzschild solution, as described for instance in [1], transforms it to a form

$$ds^2 = - \frac{du}{1-uv} \frac{dv}{uv} e^{w(u,v)} + r(u,v)^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (2)$$

from which the global properties can be understood. Here $r(u,v)$ and $w(u,v)$ are certain functions whose details are not so material. The important properties come from the singularities at $uv = 1$. There are two branches of this singularity, as u and v may be both negative or both positive. The “physical region” is the region $uv < 1$ between the two singularities. The branch of the singularity with $u, v < 0$ is the “white hole” singularity; it is to the past of the physical region, and can emit but not absorb matter. The branch of the singularity with $u, v > 0$ is the “black hole” singularity; being to the future of the physical region, it can

[★] Lecture at Strings '91, Stonybrook, June 1991.

[†] Research supported in part by NSF Grant PHY86-20266.

absorb but not emit. The white hole violates the predictability of the classical theory, as classically one cannot predict what it will emit. Relativists have dealt with the white hole by the *cosmic censorship hypothesis*, according to which white holes and more general “naked singularities” never form from acceptable initial data. (For instance, spherical stellar collapse from standard initial data gives a spacetime that coincides with the Schwarzschild solution only in the *exterior* of the collapsing star; the exterior contains the black hole singularity but not the white hole singularity.) Actually, there is not very much evidence for the cosmic censorship conjecture, and it may well be false. It is not clear that we should wish for the truth of the conjecture. If cosmic censorship is false, then in principle we would have the chance to observe new laws of physics that must take over near the would-be naked singularity. This might be more useful for physics than extending the scope of classical general relativity by proving cosmic censorship.

It is usually assumed that the new physical laws associated with a possible breakdown of cosmic censorship would involve quantum gravity, but this may be wrong, particularly in view of the fact that the length scale of string physics is probably a little larger than the Planck length. If indeed cosmic censorship is false in general relativity but its analog is true in string theory, then it may well be that it is classical string theory that becomes manifest near the would-be naked singularity.

As for black holes, at the classical level they cause no breakdown in predictability for the *outside observer*. Quantum mechanically, though, the idea that black holes exist and white holes do not is paradoxical as the white hole is the CPT conjugate of the black hole. In any event, Stephen Hawking rendered the classical picture obsolete with his discovery of black hole radiation, showing that an isolated hole will *radiate* until (after Hawking’s approximations break down) it reaches a quantum ground state or disappears completely. A key aspect of the problem of *quantum mechanics of black holes* is to describe this endpoint. More broadly, one would like to describe the *S*-matrix for matter interacting with the black hole if (as I suspect) there is one. If (as argued by Hawking) such an *S*-matrix does not exist,

one would like to get a precise account of the nature of the obstruction and to learn how to calculate in whatever framework (such as the density matrices advocated by Hawking) replaces that of S -matrices.

I think most physicists expect that Hawking radiation leads to complete disappearance of neutral black holes. For charged black holes the situation is likely to be quite different, under appropriate conditions, since a charged hole might be lighter than any collection of “ordinary particles” of the same total charge. Let us call the electric and magnetic charges of the hole q and m . A charged black hole has a *classical ground state* with mass $M = \sqrt{q^2 + m^2}$ in Planck units; this ground state is simply the extreme Reissner-Nordstrom solution of the classical field equations. One would imagine that for suitable values of the charges the classical ground state is some sort of approximation to the quantum ground state.

In this respect, the case of a magnetically charged black hole is especially interesting:

(1) This case may be realized in nature if $M_{GUT} \sim M_{Planck}$, since then the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole is a black hole. In particular it is at least conceivable that the dark matter in our galactic halo could consist of magnetically charged black holes. This hypothesis is subject to experimental test; indeed recent experiments are relatively close to the sensitivity required to exclude it [2]. Any type of discovery of galactic halo particles would give particle physics a big boost, of course, but magnetic black holes would be particularly exciting.

(2) For $e \ll 1$, the magnetic black hole is much heavier than the Planck mass and much larger than the Planck radius. Quantum gravity should therefore, in a suitable sense, have only a weak effect on the structure of the magnetic black hole, and such objects might well be accessible to human understanding, maybe even relatively soon. In particular, the deviation of the mass of a magnetic black hole from the classical value is likely to be a quantum gravity or string theory effect of order $e^2/\hbar c$. It would certainly be an unusually interesting thing to measure if magnetic black holes were ever discovered.

(3) For $M_{GUT} \ll M_{Planck}$, Callan and Rubakov have already solved a problem that is a prototype of what we want to do for $M_{GUT} \sim M_{Planck}$. They considered the case of a Dirac point monopole interacting with charged fermions. This classical system does not quite make sense, since there are certain classical s wave modes that go in but do not come out, or go out but did not come in; in more technical terms, to give a self-adjoint extension of the Hamiltonian requires additional information not present in the classical theory. The problem has a striking analogy with the Schwarzschild space-time where again the problem is that there are modes (emitted from the past singularity) that go out but did not come in, and there are other modes (absorbed by the future singularity) that go in but do not go out. In solving the $M_{GUT} \ll M_{Planck}$ problem, Callan and Rubakov showed that a two dimensional s -wave effective field theory gives a good description of monopoles in that regime. It seems natural to hope that this is still true if $M_{GUT} \sim M_{Planck}$. That would mean that some of the important qualitative aspects of black hole physics could be described by an effective two dimensional field theory.

In the case studied by Callan and Rubakov, the relevant two dimensional field theory is weakly coupled, but still requires careful analysis and exhibits striking phenomena, precisely because a naive form of the weak coupling limit would give back the pathologies of the classical system. It is reasonable to hope that their work is a prototype for at least some aspects of the black hole problem.

What is the status of black holes in string theory? One might have believed that, because of the excellent short distance behavior, there would be no classical singularities in string theory. But it has been found recently that the very metric $ds^2 = -du \, dv / (1 - uv)$ that is the essence of the black hole gives a conformal field theory. In fact, there is a conformal field theory with a two dimensional target space, parametrized by two variables u and v , and a world-sheet action

$$I = \int d^2\sigma \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial_\alpha u \partial^\alpha v}{1 - uv} \right) + R^{(2)} \Phi(u, v) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Phi(u, v) = \ln(1 - uv) + \text{constant}$ is the dilaton field. The Euclidean version

of this solution was first found by Elitzur, Forge, and Rabinovici [3]. Different forms of the solution were rediscovered by several authors from various points of view [4,5,6] (and implicitly discussed in current algebra by Bars; see his lecture at this conference and references therein) before I rediscovered the solution as an $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/U(1)$ coset model and interpreted it as a black hole [7].

It is no accident that this system involves a target space-time so similar to the Schwarzschild solution. The general s wave ansatz of four dimensional general relativity

$$ds^2 = g_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta + e^\Phi d\Omega^2 \quad (4)$$

involves a two dimensional metric tensor g and a two dimensional scalar field Φ . These are analogous to the metric and dilaton field of the low energy limit of string theory, and indeed the two dimensional action that one gets by dimensional reduction of four dimensional general relativity with the ansatz (4) is very similar to the familiar lowest order action

$$I = \int d^2x \sqrt{g} e^\Phi (R + (\nabla\Phi)^2 + 8) \quad (5)$$

of the graviton-dilaton system in string theory. The analogy is even better if one considers the dimensional reduction of general relativity in the presence of a spherically symmetric magnetic field, so as to get a system in which the black hole has a classical ground state.

If one writes the black hole sigma model (3) in Schwarzschild-like coordinates, and traces what the Hawking radiation ought to mean in this situation [7], one sees, at least heuristically, what the endpoint of the Hawking radiation ought to be: it should be the standard flat space-time of the usual $c = 1$ model, with a linear dilaton field. In making an analogy of the $c = 1$ model with four dimensional black holes, this makes it clear how we should think about the linear dilaton field: it is the “field” of an “object” sitting at $r = -\infty$ (where the tachyon potential corresponding to the world-sheet Liouville interaction is large). The standard

$c = 1$ flat space-time should therefore be thought of as an analog, not of four dimensional Minkowski space, but of the extreme Reissner-Nordstrom solution in four dimensions. This enables us to understand intuitively the otherwise annoying absence of Poincaré invariance in the model.

The field theory of the s -wave sector of general relativity is an interesting two dimensional field theory, which for many years has looked like a tempting model of the quantum physics of black holes – particularly in view of the analogy with the Callan-Rubakov effect that I explained before. Of course to get a real model of black hole physics, one must couple this system to “matter.” The s -wave component of a neutral scalar field would be a satisfactory form of matter mathematically, but there is a perhaps more “physical” candidate – in the field of a monopole of minimal Dirac charge, the usual quarks and leptons have s -wave components (which are important in the Callan-Rubakov effect). The combined system of spherically symmetric geometry and s -wave fermions is weakly coupled if $e \ll 1$. Despite the weak coupling, the s -wave field theory of magnetic black holes has defied understanding (at least at my hands).

String theory with $c = 1$ or $D = 2$ is superficially a very similar system, with the massless “tachyon” playing the role of the bosonized s -wave fermions. It is believed to be exactly soluble via matrix models. The already computed S -matrix of this model can probably be understood as a long-sought example of an S -matrix for matter interacting quantum mechanically with a black hole. If we could get a good understanding of the space-time interpretation of the matrix model results, we could probably sharpen our understanding of black holes.

The most striking puzzle in this area is probably the apparent absence in the matrix model of an analog of the expected back-reaction of matter on the gravitational field. In other words, if $D = 2$ string theory really does describe target space gravity, one would expect to see in the theory a suitable analog of the back-reaction of matter on gravity. In the matrix model, all that we presently see that might even loosely be regarded as “gravity” is the one body Hamiltonian of the

free fermions (which is the “background” in which they are moving). But the free fermions have no back reaction on their own Hamiltonian. Perhaps some degrees of freedom (analogous to the dilaton?) have been suppressed or integrated out in the matrix model description. A proper understanding of this point will probably help make it clear how much can be learned about real black holes from $D = 2$ string theory.

REFERENCES

1. C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman and Co., 1973), especially pp. 831-2.
2. S. Orito et. al., “Search For Supermassive Relics With a 2000m² Array Of Plastic Track Detectors,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 1951.
3. S. Elitzur, A. Forge, and E. Rabinovici, “Some Global Aspects of String Compactifications,” preprint RI-141(90).
4. K. Bardakci, M. Crescimanno, and E. Rabinovici, “Parafermions From Coset Models,” LBL preprint (1990).
5. M. Rocek, K. Schoutens, and A. Sevrin, “Off-Shell WZW Models In Extended Superspace,” IASSNS-HEP-91/14.
6. G. Mandal, A. Sengupta, and S. Wadia, “Classical Solutions Of 2-Dimensional String Theory,” IASSYS-HEP/91/10.
7. E. Witten, “String Theory And Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 314.